

Roseburg District Resource Advisory Committee  
Meeting Minutes of Monday, **April 22, 2002**  
Roseburg District Office  
777 NW Garden Valley Blvd., Roseburg, Oregon

Committee Members Present:

Bob Kinyon - Environmental Org., Chair  
Donald Ollivant - Environmental Org.  
Leonard Schussel - Teacher  
Maryjane Snocker - Environmental Org.  
Clem Dewart - Historical Interests  
Ronald Breyne - School Official  
Mike Estes - Developed Recreation  
Tom Van Epps - Energy & Mineral Dvlpmt.  
Mike Piehl - Commercial Recreation  
Gary Schroeder - Commercial Timber Industry, Vice Chair  
William Burnett - School Official  
Judith Bacon - Elected Official  
Shirley Cairns - Public at Large

Alternates Present:

N/A

Committee Members Arrived Late:

Janice Green - Dispersed Recreation  
Jeannie Weakley - Organized Labor

Alternates Absent:

Terry Westfall  
David Elder  
David Lorenz  
Sam Huff  
John Hope

Public Introductions: N/A

Others Present:

Jake Winn - Project Manager  
Cary Osterhaus - District Manager, DFO

WELCOME:

Chairman, Bob Kinyon, called the RAC meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. A quorum was met.

Approval of minutes will be done later in the meeting.

REVIEW AND REFINING OF MEETING GUIDELINES:

- Expectations & Roles of Members and Facilitators:
- facilitators:
    - guide meetings, maintain order
    - decisions made should be posted on flip chart
    - resolve problems/questions
    - implement Guidelines
    - be cautious about expressing own opinion

Chair:

- good working relationship with group, while maintaining a neutral role
- will lead the District on 1) projects, and 2) approval when it is time to take a vote
- everyone gets fair time at table
- presentations should draw out information for decision-making
- make sure each person understands the point
- look at whole picture in pursuit of compromise

➤ Alternates:

Cary explained that this legislation (Association of Oregon Counties) defines alternates (intent of law) as follows:

- to be available to step in when someone leaves
- bars them from participating otherwise
- Cary has the authority to ask them to leave if interrupting
- no expectation that they attend meetings

The nomination has been sent out to fill the vacant alternate position that the Charter requires.

He said we “need to operate with the law given us. We are obligated to the Secretary of Interior since this is her RAC.” He reported that his “Authority to Approve” was approved.

Zane asked for recommendations on which alternate should be brought in 1<sup>st</sup>? Results were:

Category 3 **Burnett "motion: Westfall 1<sup>st</sup> Alternate". "Ollivant seconded". (2<sup>nd</sup> Alternate is vacant)**

Category 2 **Snocker "motion: Dave Lorenz 1<sup>st</sup> Alternate & Sam Huff 2<sup>nd</sup> Alternate". "Breyne seconded".**

Category 1 **Schussel "motion: Dave Elder 1<sup>st</sup> Alternate & John Hope as 2<sup>nd</sup> Alternate". "Dewart seconded".**

**Ollivant "motion to break at 10:45". "Estes seconded".**

**Breyne "moved to bring motion back to table". "Schussel seconded."**

**Burnett "motion: Hope to be 1<sup>st</sup> Alternate, Category 1". "Estes seconded." Moved.**

#### REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM APRIL 15 MEETING:

Lynn Koens will keep the official record of the minutes.

➤ Changes to April 15, 2002, minutes:

- John Hope present, Elder absent (pg 1)
- correct: Tordol to Tordon (pg 1)
- change: more toxic to less toxic (pg 1)
- change: Garlon is not a BLM-approved herbicide (pg 1)
- add Seed Collection to list: “discuss at future meetings” (pg 6)
- Schroeder asked “whether Rock Stock Piles will be 1<sup>st</sup> on the list”, not “that” (pg 6)

**Ollivant "motion to approve the minutes". "Estes seconded."**

#### DISCUSS VALUES AND PHILOSOPHY:

➤ Project Categories:

Issue: lower-prioritized proposals didn't get full discussion. Take time to talk about each proposal.

- Cary said projects will be identified up front.
- Cary explained that Natural Resources background was an asset for facilitator position, plus hired for skills and processes that will work.

Committee objectives in Charter:

- how to spend dollars
- approve projects as a group
- committee goals
- vision for 5 years down the road

Cary reminded the Committee that they are making recommendations only. The scope of recommendations is at District level.

Discussion: what to accomplish in the next 6 months/next 5 years? Why did you want to be on the RAC, and what is most important to you when you consider a project?

<i>concerns of money spent</i> <i>balanced approach to timber and environmental issues</i> <i>why projects are so expensive</i> <i>cutting timber in the future</i> <i>involve kids in projects</i> <i>getting education and pass that along</i> <i>getting land managers to use scientific issues</i> <i>is project scientifically defensible, is it ecologically sound</i>	<i>to see project results, benefits of Jobs-in-the-Woods</i> <i>recreation to be included in equation to manage forest</i> <i>impacts of recommendations</i> <i>money for schools</i> <i>doable constraints</i> <i>local control group</i> <i>watershed health</i>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Clem Dewart left at 12:15.

Jeannie Weakley in at 1:15 p.m.

Reconvene at 1:15 p.m.

The revised Meeting Guidelines were handed out. Dewart was fine with list.

**Ollivant “motion to accept list”. “Piehl seconded.” “Approved.”**

#### PROCESS FOR CHOOSING AND PRIORITIZING PROJECTS:

Discussion: deciding the process for reviewing, recommending, and prioritizing projects in the future:

<i>scientifically defensible</i> <i>ecologically and environmentally sound</i> <i>most “bang-for-the-buck”</i> <i>timelines - ready to proceed</i> <i>money spent in Douglas County</i> <i>entry-level workplace jobs</i>	<i>long-term benefits (maybe 10 years from now)</i> <i>lasting durability</i> <i>largest positive benefit, public-broad spectrum appeal/benefit</i> <i>improves “liveability” across Douglas County</i> <i>leveraging collaborative and cooperative efforts</i> <i>multiple economical benefits</i>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

#### PROJECT INFORMATION FROM BLM:

Discussion: Cary said that some phased-projects are on the shelf and ready to prepare. Applications state where we are on each project, with continuous on-going monitoring. Jake said that every project that comes in is forwarded to the RAC and that all projects will be on the website.

➤ Evaluation Process:

Cary proposed steps for project criteria:

- use list as a screening tool as projects come in
- categorize by categories as basis for funding
- set up scale for top projects
- fill in spreadsheet

Chair Kinyon suggested on applications have biologists, engineers explain (w/pictures) to provide a break in any dead-lock between categories. Jake said the application packet will hold supplemental information. Cary asked how much information about each project do we need to provide you to make a reasonable decision? What information do you want for the evaluation process?

- |                   |                               |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|
| - age-class       | - location of project         |
| - ownership       | - who, what, where, when, why |
| - land allocation | - more visuals, presentations |
| - GIS             |                               |

After prework - submit and group together. Can use own tool, or take Jake's list: (1) scientifically, (2) ecological, and (3) most bang-for-the-buck.

Chair added that there are 35 projects proposed. Suggests: 1<sup>st</sup>) take 1 category, 2<sup>nd</sup>) then choose top one from category, and 3<sup>rd</sup>) do each of 7 categories. Then choose top one of each.

SUMMARIZE:

➤ Zane led the group in organizing the next few meetings:

- June 10<sup>th</sup> - Jake will give presentation/overview of some projects and have specialists available to answer questions.
- June 10<sup>th</sup> - 24<sup>th</sup> - each member will do prioritization process. Email or FAX to Elaine & Zane.
- before June 24<sup>th</sup> - overall project assessment. Compile lists that were emailed in.
- June 24<sup>th</sup> - discuss list.
- July 8<sup>th</sup> - field trip. Target others to evaluate.
- the two meetings in July will provide more detailed information/presentations.

**Cairns "motion: after June 10<sup>th</sup> - each person will prioritize own top five/seven projects in our list. June 24<sup>th</sup> each person will have sheets of top seven." "Ollivant seconded."**

Cary suggested that BLM present their top five/seven projects on June 10th also, then the Committee can compare lists, discuss and merge.

**Estes "amendment: June 24<sup>th</sup> - BLM will bring seven prioritized projects." "Accepted by original motion".**

Schroeder asked "can we use proxy to submit information before the 24<sup>th</sup>?" Discussion included that it may not be a good idea as it could become a habit.

Chair agreed that last time original recommendation projects were past over because of funding. They need to be reevaluated. That doesn't make them priority. Put them in the mix.

Cary explained that Suicide, Trapper, Grizzley projects were not funded for future years. We need to bring them back. Asked about multi-funding projects, he answered "yes".

#### REVIEW APPLICATION FORM:

Jake said the "Revised Application Form" is similar to last year's. He would like to make it available to the public and internally as soon as possible. He pointed out that the Table would be "Total" not "year by year".

Discussion/suggestions:

- submit at least one photo
- add information of key people on Project
- add long-term benefits and lasting effects, projected impact, references
- area, land ownership up and downstream, age-class, maps to make better decision
- GIS group to give 1 hr presentation with computer simulation.

Jake will get information after the 10<sup>th</sup> and will provide land use designation.

The next meeting will be June 10<sup>th</sup>, 2002, at 9 a.m. at the Roseburg BLM Office.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Debrief by Elaine.

---

Lynn Koens